

### REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were pending as of the action mailed February 8, 2007.

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent.

Claims 4, 10 and 16 are being amended to correct the usage of trademarks as suggested by the examiner.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9 and 13-15 are being amended to add clarity and definition, without changing their scope. Support for these amendments can be found at least at lines 12-17 of page 3 and lines 16-29 of page 8 of the application.

Claims 7 and 13 are also being amended to moot the actual and suggested rejections of those claims under section 101. Support for these amendments can be found at least at line 7 and lines 24-25 of page 9 and (for claim 13) lines 21-22 of page 6 of the application.

Dependent claims 19-21 are new. Support for claims 19-21 can be found at least at lines 15-18 of page 7 of the application.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks Examiner Steelman for granting an in-personal interview on March 22, 2007. The time spent with the applicant's representatives, Hans Troesch and Arrienne Lezak, was greatly appreciated. During the interview the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. Recommendations were made by the examiner, which recommendations have been incorporated into the claims as noted above.

### **Specification**

The specification is being amended to correct the usage of trademarks, as suggested by the examiner. The specification is being additionally amended to correct clerical errors.

### **Drawings**

The examiner has objected to the drawings (FIGs. 1-6) as lacking the label "Replacement Sheet" at the top of each page. Formal drawings, labeled in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet", are being submitted with this amendment.

Withdraw of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under Section 101**

The examiner has rejected claims 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution and without prejudice, claims 7 and 13 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion to overcome the rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Withdraw of the rejection of claims 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under Section 102**

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 7-9, 12, 13-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,079,648 ("Griffin").

#### Claim 1, 7 and 13

To expedite prosecution and without prejudice, claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, as noted above. The applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

#### Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14-15 and 18

The remaining claims that depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

### **Rejections under Section 103**

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Griffin in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/133880 (“Paternostro”).

#### Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17

As noted above, claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended in accordance with the examiner's recommendations.

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

#### New claims 19, 20 and 21

The applicant has added new claims 19-21, support for which is enumerated above.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Andreas Blumenthal, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/723,769  
Filed : November 26, 2003  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-151001 / 2003P00555  
US

The fee for one additional claim is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 May 2007

Arrienne M. Lezak  
Reg. No. 51,943  
for  
Hans R. Troesch  
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 32864  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071